



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,656	09/15/2003	Ronald S. Barchi	FSP0030	9387
7590	06/13/2006		EXAMINER	
FSP LLC Attn: Charles A. Mirho P.O. Box 890 Vancouver, WA 98666				TRAN, ELLEN C
				ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER
				2134

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/662,656	BARCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ellen C. Tran	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication: filed on 2 March 2006 with acknowledgement of an original application filed 15 September 2003.
2. Claims 2-13 are currently pending in this application. Claims 2, 7, and 9 are independent claims. Claims 2, 4, 5, and 9 have been amended. Claim 1 has been cancelled. Amendment to the claims is accepted.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 2 March 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, when the claims were amended a new rejection is noted below.

In response to applicant's argument on beginning on page 5 and summarized on page 8, "Skog fails to teach at all the use of a special code from the terminal device indicating that name/password information will not be provided". The Office disagrees with argument for multiple reasons, one reason is that the term "special code" is never mentioned in the claim or the disclosure. Applicant is trying to read more information into the claims than was disclosed, claim 2 as amended now indicates: "**A device comprising: logic which when applied to the processor, results locating a subscriber identifier corresponding to an IP address; locating subscriber information corresponding to the identifier; and determining whether a subscriber has access to a requested service; in response to receiving a code from a terminal device, the code indicating that a unique username and password will not be provided by the terminal device**" this is interpreted to be equivalent to Skog paragraphs 0010 and 0030. Note, the device comprising is interpreted to be equivalent to a first server or any of the other servers described in Skog that may utilize single sign-on ability this is interpreted to be

equivalent to code that indicates no username or password will be provided by the mobile terminal.

In response to applicant's argument on page 6, "Skog fails to disclose IP address provided to a service provider". The Office disagrees with argument for numerous reasons, one claim 6 indicates "further comprising : logic which when applied to the processor, results in querying a RADIUS server to locate the subscriber identifier corresponding to the IP address" claim 6 does not indicate a "service provider" claim 6 is want the RADIUS server to be able to locate subscriber ID corresponding to the IP address, this is shown below in the office action as well as in Skog paragraphs 0010 and 0019.

In response to applicant's argument on page 6, "One aspect of claim 6 is logic which, when applied to the processor, results in querying a RADIUS server to locate the subscriber identifier corresponding to the IP address. Skog does not teach querying the RADIUS server for a subscriber ID corresponding to an IP address. Skog teaches that the request from the access server 160 to the RADIUS server 165 to access a particular application already includes the MSISDN and IP address for the mobile terminal". The Office disagree with argument paragraph 0010 of Skog teaches that "The other servers may obtain the MSISDN of the mobile terminal responsive to these requests from the mobile terminal using the IP address and use the MSISDN to obtain additional data about the user from other user databases with the service network". Therefore, the Examiner interprets this along with other paragraphs cited in Skog to be equivalent to querying a RADIUS server (i.e. other server) to locate the subscriber ID corresponding to the IP address.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public States.

4. **Claims 2-13**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Skog et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0028636 (hereinafter ‘636).

As to independent claim 2, “A device comprising: a processor; and logic which, when applied to the processor in response to receiving a service request, results in locating a subscriber identifier corresponding to an IP address; locating subscriber information corresponding to the identifier; and determining whether a subscriber has access to a requested service” is taught in ‘636 page 1, paragraph 0010

“further comprising: logic which, when applied to the processor, results in the acts of claim 1 in response to receiving a code from a terminal device, the code indicating that a unique username and password will not be provided by the terminal device” is shown in ‘636 page 3, paragraphs 0028-0030.

As to dependent claim 3, “further comprising: logic which, when applied to the processor, results in communication of the code and IP address to a service provider” is disclosed in ‘636 page 3, paragraphs 0029-0030.

As to dependent claim 4, “further comprising: logic which, when applied to the processor, results in forming an account name from the identifier” is taught in ‘636 page 3, paragraphs 0029-0030.

As to dependent claim 5, “wherein the identifier is an MSISDN” is shown in ‘636 page 3, paragraph 0029.

As to dependent claim 6, “further comprising: logic which, when applied to the processor, results in querying a RADIUS server to locate the subscriber identifier corresponding to the IP address” is disclosed in ‘636 page 3, paragraph 0029.

As to independent claim 7, “A terminal device comprising: a processor; and logic which, when applied to the processor, results in communicating to a network, in lieu of a user name and password, a code to cause the network to authenticate and authorize access to a service, the authentication and authorization based upon an IP address assigned to the terminal device by the network and upon a unique identifier provided by the terminal device to the network during an earlier attach process” is taught in ‘636 page 3, paragraphs 0028-0029.

As to dependent claim 8, “further comprising: client logic associated with a service provider, which, when applied to the processor to access the service provider, results in communicating the code and IP address to the network in lieu of communicating a user name and password” is shown in ‘636 page 3, paragraphs 0028-0029.

As to independent claim 9, “A method comprising: receiving a code from a terminal device that indicates that a user name and password; locating a subscriber identifier corresponding to an IP address of the terminal device; locating subscriber information corresponding to the identifier; and determining whether a subscriber has access to a requested service” is disclosed in ‘636 page 3, paragraphs 0029-0030.

As to dependent claim 10, “further comprising: communicating the code and IP address to at least one service provider to obtain authorization for the services of the at least one service provider” is taught in ‘636 page 3, paragraph 0033.

As to dependent claim 11, “further comprising: forming from the identifier an account name for the subscriber” is shown in ‘636 page 3, paragraph 0030.

As to dependent claim 12, “wherein the identifier is an MSISDN” is disclosed in ‘636 page 3, paragraph 0029.

As to dependent claim 13, “further comprising: querying a RADIUS server to locate the MSISDN corresponding to the IP address” is taught in ‘636 page 3, paragraph 0029.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ellen C Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3842. The examiner can normally be reached from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jacques H. Louis-Jacques can be reached on (571) 272-6962. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ECT

Ellen Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2134
9 June 2006

JACQUES H. LOUIS-JACQUES
PRIMARY EXAMINER